

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

BELOIT HEALTH SYSTEM, INC.,

Plaintiff,
v.

SAVISTA, LLC,

Defendant.

ORDER

24-cv-379-jdp

Plaintiff Beloit Health System asserts claims for breach of contract based on defendant Savista, LLC's alleged failure to provide agreed-upon claims management services. The parties have filed cross-motions for summary judgment. Beloit Health's summary judgment submissions violate the court's procedures for proposed findings of fact: Beloit Health did not submit replies to its own proposed facts, it responded to defendants' proposed facts in narrative form as opposed to separately numbered paragraphs, and it did not include facts relating to jurisdiction. *See Procedures for Civil Cases Assigned to Judge Peterson*, attachment to Dkt. 23, at 2–3.

After Savista pointed out the errors with Beloit Health's summary judgment submissions in its reply brief, Beloit Health moved to supplement its submissions to fix the errors. Dkt. 64. Beloit Health has not provided a good reason for failing to follow the court's summary judgment procedures. Nevertheless, Savista is not prejudiced because Beloit Health's late submissions don't raise new issues; they merely convert Beloit Health's incorrectly formatted proposed facts to the correct format. The motion to supplement is granted. The court accepts Dkt. 65 as plaintiff's response to defendant's proposed findings of fact; Savista has until July 11 to file a reply to these proposed findings of fact. The court also accepts Dkt. 66

as plaintiff's reply to its own proposed findings of fact and response to Savista's supplemental findings of fact. The court will strike Dkt. 67 as redundant; the proposed facts in this document are the same as in Dkt. 66 except for the addition of facts related to jurisdiction, but these new facts are not necessary because Beloit Health's responses to Savista's proposed findings of fact are sufficient to establish jurisdiction.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff Beloit Health System, Inc.'s motion to supplement its summary judgment submissions, Dkt. 64, is GRANTED. The court accepts Dkt. 65 and Dkt. 66 as plaintiff's response to defendant's proposed facts and reply to its own proposed facts.
2. The clerk of court is ordered to STRIKE Dkt. 67 as redundant.
3. Defendant Savista, LLC has until July 11 to reply to Dkt. 65, plaintiff's response to defendant's proposed findings of fact.

Entered June 30, 2025.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

JAMES D. PETERSON
District Judge